

REMARKS

With the foregoing amendment claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 9 and 12 are amended. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 3, 9, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 3, 9, and 12 have been amended so that all of the features recited therein have proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 be withdrawn.

II. Claim Objection.

Claim 3 is objected to because it contains a typographical error. Claim 3 has been amended to fix this typographical error. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 3 be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102 (Novelty)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Carbonell et al (US 6,139,201) (hereafter "Carbonell"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

A. Claim 1

Carbonell does not anticipate claim 1 because Carbonell does not disclose all of the features of claim 1. More specifically, Carbonell does not disclose any one of the steps (a) through (e) recited in claim 1. With respect to step (e), claim 1, as amended, recites:

(e) creating the translation of the sentence based on the semantic information items determined through man-machine complementation and converting the semantic information items determined through man-machine complementation into translation symbols which are provided together with the translation of the sentence to the user of the translation for his check.

Accordingly, as recited in claim 1, not only is a translation of the sentence created, but also the semantic information items are converted into translation symbols. We emphasize that claim 1 requires providing to the user both the translation and the translation symbols. Both the translation and the translation symbols are provided to the user so that the user can check the validity of the translation. Carbonell does not disclose this feature. More specifically, Carbonell simply does not disclose converting the semantic information items into translation symbols. Rather, Carbonell discloses only creating the translation and providing the translation to the user. Accordingly, because Carbonell does not also create translation symbols from semantic information items and provide those translation symbols to the user together with the translation, Carbonell can not anticipate claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

B. Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, and 10

Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, and 10 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, these claims are patentable over Carbonell for at the least the same reason give above with respect to claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2, 4, 6, 7, and 10 be withdrawn.

C. Claim 11

Carbonell does not anticipate claim 11 because Carbonell does not disclose all of the features of claim 11. The assertion of the Examiner that the “semanteme marking means,” “marked text storage means,” “marking instruction means,” and “marking display means” in claim 11 are all disclosed by Carbonell is incorrect. The parts in Carbonell mentioned by the Examiner all relate to the display of synonyms but not the display or storage of “marked information”. Therefore, claim 11 is not anticipated by Carbonell. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.

D. Claims 13 and 14

Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 11. Accordingly, these claims are patentable over Carbonell for at the least the same reason give above with respect to claim 11. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 13 and 14 be withdrawn.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103 (Obviousness)

Claims 3 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Carbonell in view of Uramoto (US 5,844,798), claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Carbonell in view of Chong (US 5,497,319), and claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Carbonell in view of Takanashi (US 5,442,780). Applicant respectfully traverses.

A. Claim 3

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over the art of record for at least the same reason given above with respect to claim 1. Moreover, claim 3 is patentable over Carbonell in view of Uramoto because neither Carbonell nor Uramoto, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features of claim 3.

The Examiner asserts that the feature of “commonly restricting various natural languages” is taught by Carbonell because Carbonell uses the concept of constrained source language (CSL). Applicant disagrees with the Examiner in this regard because “commonly restricting” and “CSL” are not the same concept. As defined in claim 3, “commonly restricting” includes the steps of:

- a1. unifying syntax concepts in various natural languages having same concepts but for modifying different objects;
- a2. deleting as many as possible syntax concepts which are not indispensable;
- a3. establishing a basic concept set commonly used by various languages through statistically analyzing the use frequency of words and merging synonyms in natural languages;
- a4. taking the synonyms of the basic concepts in various natural languages as the attached near words of the basic concepts, and in case no corresponding synonym can be

found in one language, using the corresponding basic concept[s] in the language as substitute;
a5. for those natural language words or concepts which can not be expressed by the basic concepts, providing blank information items by the dialogue template.

The Examiner asserts step a1 is disclosed in Carbonell at col. 27, lines 6-15 and col. 28, lines 16-21, but Applicant could not find any teaching of a1 in Carbonell. The Examiner also asserts step a2 is disclosed in Carbonell at col. 26, lines 49-55, but Applicant could not find any teaching of a2 in Carbonell. That is, Carbonell simply does not teach or suggest “unifying syntax concepts in various natural languages having same concepts but for modifying different objects” or “deleting as many as possible syntax concepts which are not indispensable,” both of which are recited in claim 3.

In short, the concept of “commonly restricting natural languages” is not taught or implied in Carbonell. In fact, CSL aims to disambiguate the source language by changing natural language text into CSL text. CSL concerns only the source language. It only constrains the source language so that the source language text has no ambiguity. Col.14, lines 5-12 also only describes source language need not to be American English but can be various languages, but does not mention the relation between the source language and the target languages. Thus, Carbonell does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 3. Moreover, Uramoto does not make up for the deficient teachings of Carbonell. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

B. Claims 5 and 8


Claims 5 and 8 depends from claim 1 and are patentable over the art of record for at least the same reason given above with respect to claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 5 and 8 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be

withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,					
<i>NAME AND REG. NUMBER</i>	Brian Rosenbloom, Registration No.: 41,276				
<i>SIGNATURE</i>		<i>DATE</i>	2/2/2005		
<i>Address</i>	Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.				
<i>City</i>	Washington	<i>State</i>	D.C.	<i>Zip Code</i>	20005
<i>Country</i>	U.S.A.	<i>Telephone</i>	202-783-6040	<i>Fax</i>	202-783-6031